

REMARKS

Initially, Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the recent in-person interview held between the Examiner and Applicant's representative. The amendments and remarks presented herein are consistent with the discussions during that interview.

The Office Action, mailed September 13, 2006, considered and rejected claims 1-30. Claim 21 was objected to for minor formalities.¹ Claims 1-20 and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.² Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.³ Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balaji et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2005/0015439 in view of Hibbert ("Visual Flex and XML").⁴

By this paper, claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 15, 20, 21 and 28-30 have been amended, while no claims have been added or cancelled.⁵ Accordingly, following this paper, claims 1-30 remain pending, of which claims 1, 15, 21 and 28 are the only independent claims at issue.

As discussed during the interview, Applicant's invention is generally directed to methods and computer systems for providing interoperability of contact data stored according to a variety of schemas. For example, as recited in claim 1, a method includes receiving, at an application that lacks the configuration to access schematized contact data, a request to access the schematized contact data. The application thus calls an external contact data control that abstracts the formatting of the schematized contact data from the application calling the external

¹ In light of the amendments above, Applicant respectfully submits that the informalities in Claim 21 have been corrected, and that the objection is now moot.

² Applicant submits that claims 1-30 are each directed to statutory subject matter, particularly in light of the amendments above. For example, claims 1-20 recite methods which include, among other things, rendering contact data for a user. In addition, claims 21-30 are directed to statutory computer systems, rather than processes, which include a processor and computer readable storage media.

³ As discussed during the interview, the claims recite that the non-schematized contact data corresponds to schematized contact data, thereby establishing the connection between the two types of data. Moreover, the claims, as amended, recite that non-schematized contact data is converted from schematized contact data. In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is now moot.

⁴ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

⁵ Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout Applicant's original application, including the disclosure in original paragraphs 18-20, 46, 66, 67, 69 and 74, and in Figures 2 and 3.

data control. From the external contact data control, the application then receives non-schematized contact data that was converted from corresponding schematized contact data by the external data contact control. Thereafter, the application renders, on a display device, rendered contact data corresponding to the non-schematized contact data.⁶

While Balaji is generally directed towards a flexible architecture for providing data integration between multiple web services, Applicant respectfully submits that it fails to teach or suggest Applicant's invention as recited above. For example, among other things, Balaji, whether alone or in combination with Hibbert, fails to teach or suggest a method or system in which an external contact control abstracts formatting information for the schematized contact data from the same application that called the external contact data control, as recited in combination with the other claim elements.

In particular, Balaji discloses a flexible architecture component (FAC) in which client applications are coupled to a network to access any of various data sources having data stored in different formats that are not directly accessible by some of the other client applications. (¶ 15). To translate the data between formats of the various client applications, the client applications first register with the FAC and provide the semantics and syntax of their native data for storage in a schema registry 22 of the FAC. (¶ 28). In particular, using a Web interface 32, which is outside the client application, an operator provides a schema definition for the client by entering tag information about the schema in the table. (¶ 33; Fig. 1). Using that information, a schema generator 150, which is part of the FAC, then specifies the syntax and semantics of the data in an XML schema definition, which can then be stored in a schema registry 22. (¶¶ 33, 34, 42). An adapter 30 is also then created which contains information on how to create XML data from the client application data and how to access FAC database files for the client application, and the adapter 30 is then inserted into the client application (¶¶ 35, 36).

Accordingly, Balaji teaches a system in which information on how to convert between client application data (non-schematized data) and XML data (schematized data) is stored in a schema registry which is external to the application and in a plug-in adapter which facilitates translation between the non-schematized data and the XML data. Moreover, the information on the non-schematized data, so that it can be related to XML for translation, is also received

⁶ Independent claims 15, 21 and 28 recite a method (claim 15) and computing systems (claims 21 and 28) which generally correspond to the method of claim 1.

through an external interface rather than from the application. Thus, as discussed during the interview, the formatting of the schematized XML data is retrieved from the schema registry and the adapter, rather than being abstracted from the application which makes use of non-schematized data, as claimed in combination with the other claim elements.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 20th day of November, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 047973

JCJ:ahy
AHY000002119V001